Case 1:18-mj-03161-KMW Document 73 Filed 06/05/18 Page 1 of 40

I5u2cohC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 In the Matter of Search Warrants 3 Executed on April 9, 2018 -----x 4 MICHAEL D. COHEN, 5 Plaintiff, 6 18 MJ 3161 V. 7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Conference 8 Defendant. 9 10 New York, N.Y. May 30, 2018 10:30 a.m. 11 12 Before: 13 HON. KIMBA M. WOOD, 14 District Judge 15 **APPEARANCES** 16 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 17 Attorneys for Plaintiff BY: TODD HARRISON 18 STEPHEN M. RYAN JOSEPH B. EVANS 19 20 ROBERT S. KHUZAMI Acting United States Attorney for 21 the Southern District of New York THOMAS A. McKAY 22 RACHEL A. MAIMIN NICOLAS ROOS 23 ANDREA GRISWOLD Assistant United States Attorneys 24 25

Case 1:18-mj-03161-KMW Document 73 Filed 06/05/18 Page 2 of 40

I5u2cohC 1 Also Present: 2 SPEARS & IMES LLP 3 Attorneys for Intervenor Donald J. Trump, President BY: JOANNA C. HENDON 4 5 LAW OFFICES OF ALAN S. FUTERFAS 6 Attorneys for Intervenor The Trump Organization 7 BY: ALAN S. FUTERFAS ELLEN RESNICK 8 9 MICHAEL AVENATTI Attorney for Interested Party Stephanie Clifford a/k/a "Stormy Daniels" 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 (Case called) 2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state their 3 appearances. 4 MS. MAIMIN: Good morning, your Honor. Rachel Maimin, 5 Thomas McKay, Andrea Griswold, and Nicholas Roos for the 6 government. 7 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. HARRISON: Good morning, your Honor. Todd 8 Harrison, Steve Ryan, and Joseph Evans for Michael Cohen. 9 10 THE COURT: Good morning. And good morning, 11 Mr. Cohen. 12 MS. HENDON: Good morning, your Honor. For the 13 president intervenor, Joanna Hendon, Chris Dysard, and Reed 14 Keefe. 15 MR. FUTERFAS: Good morning, your Honor. For Trump Organization, Alan Futerfas and Ellen Resnick. 16 17 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. AVENATTI: Good morning, your Honor. Michael 18 19 Avenatti on behalf of proposed intervenor, Ms. Daniels. 20 THE COURT: Good morning. 21 I will begin by seeking the government's update on its 22 production of material. 23 MS. MAIMIN: Yes, your Honor. 24 As reflected in the report of the special master dated

yesterday, we completed our rolling production of material to

25

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

Mr. Cohen and the special master on May 22 with the exception of three items, namely, two BlackBerries that Quantico is still working on getting into and the contents of a shredding machine which we expect to produce within two to three weeks.

THE COURT: Very good.

Do you have any idea of the possible volume of materials that represents?

MS. MAIMIN: The BlackBerries we can't be certain because we are not in them, so we can't tell the volume of electronic material. I don't believe the contents of the shredding machine are voluminous at all.

> THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Cohen's production of portions of material to the intervenors, who would like to address that?

MR. HARRISON: I will address that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Harrison.

MR. HARRISON: Thank you, Judge.

So as the court is aware, the court originally set this date as a control date for ten business days after we had received everything. We have been receiving rolling productions from the government. As you heard, our last receipt of materials was on May 22. There are still some outstanding items, but we have been tackling things as soon as they come in. We have got people working diligently on them, your Honor.

Just to run quickly through the process of what we have done, the first thing we did was make sure all the parties were on the same page as to control numbers, and that required us to take the data from the government, run it through our systems, assign control numbers to everything, and then give a copy of that back to the government so they had control numbers and a copy to the special master, as well. So that was something that took some time and effort on our part.

Subsequent to that or at the same time, we received over 3.7 million files from the government, your Honor. We have gone through about 1.3 million of those, so about a third of them. So we are really tackling this diligently, and we are making pretty good progress on that.

Some of that initial time was spent on processing and uploading all that data, the large amounts of data, and then we tackled it and started reviewing it.

We have made six sets of privilege designations to the special master so far, and at the same time we have been searching for and producing — making productions to lawyers for the president and lawyers for The Trump Organization. So that's also a process that we have to go through that we have people working on. We have made nine productions so far to the lawyers for the president and The Trump Organization. So that's just taken a lot of time and effort, Judge. We have got people working all night, weekends, etc., etc. So we are

making pretty good progress.

2

3

THE COURT: Can you give me a feeling for the volume of documents for each production you mentioned now.

4

MR. HARRISON: For each production that we have received from the government, your Honor?

5

THE COURT: That you received and reviewed.

7

8

million files from the government, your Honor, and we have gone

MR. HARRISON: Well, we have received about 3.7

9

through about 1.3 million of them, so we are about a third of

10

the way through the materials that we have received from the

11

12

13

government.

those devices already.

THE COURT: All right. Is there any distinction between how difficult it is to review one production as opposed to another?

1415

16

17

18

MR. HARRISON: Yes. Certainly, Judge. The hard copy productions are relatively easy to review. The mobile data, which there has been a lot of, we have received information from 13 separate mobile devices. That takes a long time to upload. It takes a long time for us to review because of the format of the UFED reports that we received from the government

20

19

in relation to mobile devices. So that's been the majority of

2122

the information so far, and that is the most difficult to

23

process and to review, but we have gotten through a lot of

24

25

There are also, we received 19 digital media devices,

like hard drives, thumb drives, and things like that. That is easier to upload and easier to review than mobile devices, but

still, you know, a somewhat laborious process, your Honor.

THE COURT: By approximately what point in time do you expect to have reviewed the remainder of the files the government has already sent you?

MR. HARRISON: Based on the volume that we have gotten so far, Judge, and the fact that we have gotten through about a third of it, I estimate -- and it's a little bit hard to estimate, but we estimate that we will be done fully with the review approximately mid July. So we were going to suggest to the court if you wanted to put control date on for 30 days from now, that might be a good idea.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the government as to the reasonableness of this proposed deadline.

MS. MAIMIN: We don't believe that this is a reasonable deadline. As the defense counsel just stated, the material is already loaded. Our production was complete as of May 22. The UFED reports are actually produced in that format because they are easy to review and are in a format that facilitates a quicker review. One of our concerns, as the court is aware from the beginning, is delay, and that is an unreasonable delay.

THE COURT: What, in your view, would be reasonable, given your familiarity with the material?

MS. MAIMIN: Mid June, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, as counsel has pointed out, the reason for this conference initially was to see whether the special master review is proceeding almost as quickly as a taint team review would or whether it is taking much longer. It sounds as if it is taking much longer and as if we may have to revert to the taint team unless Mr. Cohen's lawyers can put enough in the way of resources into this to be finished with the current production by mid June.

MR. HARRISON: Well, Judge, we will do whatever we have to do, but I will say that that's an unreasonable deadline the government has set. And if the government was reviewing this stuff, they wouldn't have been through it in this amount of time either. And the government has not proffered any reason why they think that our date is unreasonable. They just think it is unreasonable because they want the stuff faster, and I understand that, but we are moving heaven and earth. We have people working all night. We have people sleeping on couches in our offices. We have people who worked all through the Memorial Day weekend. I had an associate yesterday who felt a tremor in his hand from lack of sleep. I had to send him home late last night. He came back at 7:30 this morning. We are working around the clock.

The government knows that this stuff takes time to review. They know what they have given us. They know the

types of media and things that they have given us. They know that this takes time to review. Whatever date we say, Judge, they were going to say they want it sooner than that, say our date was unreasonable. So I don't think they have really proffered any reasons as to why our suggested date is unreasonable, and I can assure the court that we are working around the clock. We are working as fast as we can. This stuff takes a while to get through.

THE COURT: How many lawyers are working on this full-time?

MR. HARRISON: 15, your Honor.

THE COURT: Full-time?

MR. HARRISON: 15 plus two, yes, data folk, two data specialists.

THE COURT: And they are all working full-time on this?

MR. HARRISON: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Ms. Maimin.

MS. MAIMIN: Your Honor, as I mentioned before, so much of the time -- and I think defense counsel said this, too -- that caused delay initially was the loading of the documents. That is complete. We can see that the special master is reviewing material quite expeditiously as it is received, and we believe that Mr. Cohen and the intervenor should be held to the same standard.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I think that's correct. The special master is reviewing everything quite quickly, and I think that counsel could do that if they put enough of the right type of resources into it. So by mid June you need to have finished the balance of the production that you have to date.

I understand, your Honor. I will just MR. HARRISON: point out that we have a lot of other tasks that the special master doesn't have. The special master is doing a great job, working very diligently, but we also have to do searches for the lawyers for the president and searches for lawyers for The Trump Organization, make productions to them. As I mentioned, we had to spend a certain amount of time making sure that everybody was on the same page with control numbers, so we had to run all the data, give it control numbers, and give a copy back to the government, give a copy of that to the special master, so everyone is on the same page. So we have been sort of the central repository for everything, which we are not complaining about, but there are a lot of extra tasks that we have and that the government doesn't have and that the special master doesn't have. So there is a lot of other stuff that we have to do.

THE COURT: Much of it you have already done.

MR. HARRISON: A lot of that has already been done, Judge, but the review itself just takes time. It takes time.

THE COURT: Okay. Mid June is the date.

1 Now, did the government say that you have handed over 2 everything other than two types of material? 3 MS. MAIMIN: Yes, your Honor, two BlackBerries and the 4 contents of the shredder. 5 THE COURT: Okay. If you had Mr. Cohen's assistance, 6 could you get right into the BlackBerry? 7 MS. MAIMIN: I'm not certain, your Honor. We are working through that. But it is my understanding that these --8 9 that Mr. Cohen may not have the necessary information to get 10 into the BlackBerries at this time. 11 MR. HARRISON: Judge, those are really old items. 12 There may not even be any information or any relevant 13 information on them, and we don't have any information to 14 assist the government in that. 15 THE COURT: All right. Is there any way of dating them, where they were kept, in his office or home or hotel, 16 17 Mr. Harrison? 18 MR. HARRISON: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you, your 19 Honor. 20 THE COURT: Is there any way of dating, D-A-T-I-N-G, 21 the material in the BlackBerries? You say it is very old. Can 22 you give me any more than that? 23 MR. HARRISON: Let me make an effort, Judge. Hang on 24 one second.

(Mr. Harrison and Mr. Cohen confer)

25

MR. HARRISON: Judge, I have had this discussion before, but I just wanted to double check. So our best estimate is that those devices are at least eight years old, and we believe that one of them, maybe both of them, belong to Mr. Cohen's wife. And we are talking about the two BlackBerry devices, as I understand.

THE COURT: Has the government attempted to have Mr. Cohen's wife assist in opening them?

MS. MAIMIN: No, your Honor. We were not aware that Ms. Cohen may have owned the BlackBerries. But we are happy to work with defense counsel to see if that would facilitate production.

THE COURT: It would have been helpful if Mr. Cohen's lawyers had given the government this information some time ago.

MR. HARRISON: Sorry. Just so it is clear, we don't have any information to give them. We had this discussion with the government very early on. We gave them all of the information related to those issues that we could. We don't have any more information to give them. We haven't been holding anything back from them.

THE COURT: Ms. Maimin said that she just learned that the BlackBerries may belong to Mr. Cohen's wife.

Am I right?

MS. MAIMIN: Yes. I don't believe we were previously

aware of that.

MR. HARRISON: I do believe we had discussion about that early on, Judge. We might not have been sure. In fact, I don't know that we are 100 percent sure right now, as I indicated, that those are Mr. Cohen's wife's. That's our belief. That's our best guess. They are so old that we don't know for sure.

THE COURT: All right. Would any of the intervenors wish to be heard on document production?

MS. HENDON: Your Honor, I would just say that, from the perspective of the president, the rate at which we see the government providing material to Mr. Cohen and Mr. Cohen providing it to us, we are very satisfied and pleased with that and the rate at which we are receiving material and able to make our privilege designations, and we remain very grateful to the court for implementing this process.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. FUTERFAS: Your Honor, I would just echo those remarks. When you receive the materials and start going through it, you see how intensely you do have to look at it to make real privilege reviews. We are making those privilege notations in a very, very limited, narrow, careful scope, which I think the special master appreciates. But when you get into that process, you see how much work that Mr. Cohen's lawyers are doing, and we appreciate and know how hard they are working

to accomplish this process, and we also are appreciative to the special master for her role. She has been very helpful in moving this forward. So I would add that.

THE COURT: Very good. Okay.

2.2

Mr. Avenatti has asked that I address your pending pro hac vice motion. Mr. Cohen's lawyers ask that it be held in abeyance to the extent that the motion to intervene is also in abeyance.

Let me first ask the government, do you still have a position on this or do you take no position on either motion?

MS. MAIMIN: We take no position on the *pro hac vice* motion; and, as stated in our letter to the court, we are not taking a position at this time on the motion to intervene.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Avenatti, I will be glad to hear you. I have your motion and your affidavits.

MR. AVENATTI: May I approach the podium, your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, thank you.

I am not going to repeat what has been stated in the papers as well as the supplemental affidavits that have been filed with the court.

Let me first address the motion to intervene. We have no issue and we agree with the government that that should be held in abeyance. We are continuing to have communications

with the government as to whether it will ultimately be necessary for us to intervene.

Part of the issue, your Honor, or one of the issues that bears on that is an item that we requested be taken up in the agenda relating to these audio recordings that we have become aware of that may reflect attorney-client privileged communications between my client and her former counsel, Mr. Davidson.

THE COURT: What is your information on that? You have alluded to it in general, but --

MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, I received a call last week from a member of the press who asked me to comment on an audio recording that the member of the press had evidently heard. It was an audio recording between Mr. Cohen and Mr. Davidson, my client's former counsel. During that discussion, Mr. Davidson disclosed attorney-client privileged communications that he had with my client.

Needless to say, this was a very disturbing call for me to receive, asking for comment on (a) an audio recording that appears to have been made by Mr. Cohen without permission by Mr. Davidson from all indications, and (b) why would Mr. Davidson be communicating with Mr. Cohen about attorney-client privileged communications that he was having with Ms. Clifford? And why would that then be recorded? And why would a member of the press be provided access to that

recording?

Now, there are only two places, by my estimation, your Honor, that that could have been or two sources for that information:

One, it would have to be the F.B.I. or the U.S.

Attorney's office. They would have access to it if it was obtained in the raid. I don't believe for one moment, your Honor, that either of those two organizations or entities provided that information to this reporter. I would be shocked, based on my workings with the U.S. Attorney's office over the last few weeks and how cooperative those communications have been, if anyone from their office would have leaked that to the press. I would be absolutely shocked.

So, therefore, that had to have come, from our estimation, your Honor, from Mr. Cohen or someone associated with Mr. Cohen who provided that to the press recently in an effort to paint a false narrative about my client or Mr. Davidson or for some other reason.

But, your Honor, it makes no sense to me as to why a recording would have (a) been made, (b) why Mr. Davidson would have disclosed attorney-client privileged communications without the consent or knowledge of my client -- and I can assure you, your Honor, that my client at no point in time waived the privilege or informed Mr. Davidson that such information could be provided to Mr. Cohen -- and, lastly, your

Honor, it is very disturbing to me that I don't have access to the recording. I don't know -- my understanding is, from what I was told, there are other recordings between Mr. Cohen and Mr. Davidson relating to my client and attorney-client privileged information.

Obviously we want to take steps, your Honor, to protect this information. We don't want it provided to the press. We need to be able to make a determination ultimately as to whether to waive privilege relating to communications between my client and Mr. Davidson. But as you might imagine, your Honor, all of this was very surprising and disturbing to me, as Ms. Clifford's current counsel.

THE COURT: You are essentially participating in this proceeding. It seems to me you have no standing to make these points unless you want to intervene.

MR. AVENATTI: And, your Honor, I understand that. I am only providing that by way of background to tell you that we are happy to delay our motion to intervene, in accordance with the request by the government, as we work through these issues. But sooner rather than later, that's going to have to be teed up, especially if we continue to learn of potential attorney-client privileged information that was provided by Mr. Davidson to Mr. Cohen. That's my only point, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, as it relates to the pro

hac vice application, your Honor, it is highly unusual for such an application to be denied. I'm sure your Honor is well aware of that. It is highly unusual for there to be opposition to that application. I have had the benefit of reading the opposition to the application. A lot of it relates to matters that are completely irrelevant to these proceedings, have nothing to do with these proceedings.

The argument relating to the release of the information concerning Mr. Cohen, there has been no linkage between that information and this proceeding, your Honor. There is no allegation that that information has anything to do with this proceeding whatsoever. This proceeding, currently it's not a criminal case. It is not a civil case per se. It is an "in re" proceeding relating to the seizure of documents.

Furthermore, your Honor, any claim that somehow extrajudicial statements have had any bearing on this matter or have any potential bearing on this matter, your Honor, I do not believe those arguments are well taken for the following reason: There is no jury in this proceeding. There is no trial in this proceeding. This proceeding is a proceeding, like I just stated, about documents and how documents are going to be handled and how particular privilege issues are going to be addressed by way of a special master, etc. Your Honor ultimately makes the determination, together with recommendations from Judge Jones, relating to how those

documents are to be addressed and how those documents are to be handled. Nothing that may be said in the press could potentially have any bearing on any of those decisions. Your Honor has been on the bench for a very, very long time. This is not the first high-profile case your Honor has handled by any stretch of the imagination. Your Honor is used to handling high-profile matters. Your Honor is used to have extensive media coverage relating to those matters. So nothing that could be said in connection with any statements outside of this courtroom could have any bearing on your Honor's ultimate determination.

Now, as it relates to my fitness, I have never been disciplined by any bar organization in the United States, no state bar disciplinary record whatsoever. I have been an exemplary member of the bar for 18 years. I have practiced around this country in various state and federal courts. I have tried cases in no fewer than nine different states. I have an exceptional track record.

And if your Honor would like to hear me address any particular statements or allegations from Mr. Cohen's counsel as to why my *pro hac* should not be granted, I would be more than prepared to address those, your Honor.

THE COURT: Granting your motion pro hac doesn't, as you know, give you a roving ability to bring up anything you wish in connection with this matter. You would be in here to

master might become involved in reviewing purportedly privileged materials and making a determination in consultation with you, the parties have been sharing the cost of the special master 50/50. In reviewing the material from the JAMS arbitration, that left some question in my mind about whether you would in fact share something that you say you will share.

MR. AVENATTI: Well, your Honor, let me put the court's concern at ease. There is no question whatsoever, your Honor, that if the special master spends any time working on anything relating to Ms. Clifford, we are more than happy to pay the special master's fees and costs associated with that. If need be, we are happy to put a retainer up of whatever the special master deems appropriate.

I noted in the statement filed by the special master, Judge Jones, she is billing at \$700 an hour, which I found to be incredibly reasonable, your Honor. Based on her experience, not only on the bench but as an attorney, I thought that was exceptionally low, quite honestly, at least based on my experience with New York and Los Angeles rates.

So, again, your Honor, let me put the court at ease. We will be happy to advance whatever retainer the court deems appropriate, depending on how much time is estimated as it relates to reviewing those documents. Again, it is tough for us to say, because we don't know how many audio recordings

there are. We don't know how much information was provided. We are basically flying blind, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Would you like to respond, Mr. Ryan?

MR. RYAN: Thank you, Judge.

Judge, this proceeding is about keeping confidential privileged information of the President of the United States, of Mr. Cohen, of the lawyers who have given advice to Mr. Cohen, and it is being turned on its head by Mr. Avenatti.

When he was here on April 26, he got up and spoke three different times. Not once did Mr. Cohen's lawyers rise to address his *pro hac vice* motion or the motion to intervene, not a word.

The reason I rise today is because I have never seen an attorney conduct himself in the manner that Mr. Avenatti has. Earlier this month, he deliberately took information that he knew was nonpublic, confidential information that was about my client's bank records, that were likely — almost an ineluctable conclusion that came from a SAR report. Those SAR reports cannot be made public by the law enforcement officials or by the banks who handle them. He published that information gratuitously. He intended to prejudice and cause harm to my client, and he did. He succeeded in that. The court would have to take judicial notice of the volume of media attention that was then devoted to it. But what Mr. Avenatti did in

releasing those records was entirely reckless and improper.

The second thing that Mr. Avenatti did in that same release is he improperly released the bank records of a gentleman living in Tel Aviv and he improperly released a Canadian aid worker, a distinguished civil servant of the Canadian government, and his Toronto bank account. It was a drive-by shooting of anyone named Michael Cohen that he could come up with the information.

And in the two things that he did, we came back the next day intending to raise it to the court because we had never seen anything like this. I have practiced law for 37 years, and I have never risen to oppose the *pro hac vice* motion of an attorney to practice law. And Lord knows there are people who I would rather not have been against in that time. This is not — the event that he is sidestepping is his intentional, malicious, and prejudicial release of that information.

Now, what have we learned since that came out? Within the day that I was actually filing the motion, the second day, I had spoken to the Canadian aid worker, and we were able to obtain the clarity that his records had been done. We were able, actually through the press, to obtain the Israeli newspaper article. We never spoke directly to that gentleman. I spoke directly to the man in Tanzania, is outraged that his records have been released.

On the same day, the Treasury inspector general indicated there would be an inquiry by the inspector general's office as to the likely release of the SARs reports. So that investigation is still going on.

Subsequent to that, your Honor — and we put this in the record to you — there was an extraordinary New Yorker article that quoted apparently, according to this press report, the individual who had released it, who showed in his comments that he knew that he had violated the law in releasing it. And of course no one in the press printed those bank records of my client until Mr. Avenatti released it. And I'm going to put on — upon information and belief, my phone rang off the hook the day before during the day that that release was done. He released that document under embargo to at least three different entities.

So if we want to talk about leaks to the media, that document was made available to a television network and print journalists to prepare their stories for his release that night. It was a premeditated drive-by shooting of my client's rights. That's why we are here today raising this issue.

Now, what have we learned subsequently? Within the past week, not something we did, not something we had anything to do with, a United States bankruptcy court has issued a judgment against the named partner's law firm, Avenatti & Eagan, for \$10 million. But in the course of that, your Honor,

I want to read a couple of quotes from other judges about the conduct of that case. I'm going to refer for a moment to the Florida bankruptcy judge, and the court can find the document I am reading from, it is exhibit — it is document 66-2. I'm on lines 12 and 13. And the bankruptcy judge in Florida addressed the fact that a filing was made in that bankruptcy court that says, "We have an involuntary case that has a stench of impropriety." Okay? This is one of your brethren, a judge of the United States, who had to make that ruling.

And who did that filing benefit? Well, it benefited Mr. Avenatti. He was scheduled to have his deposition taken and to provide evidence, and he didn't have to do that because of the stay.

So when we look from place to place, what's the importance of that? The importance of it is that Mr. Avenatti cannot keep his agreements. He didn't pay the money that he agreed to pay to settle this matter.

We know that he is involved in ways that call attention to himself, his 170 appearances on television -- 74 on CNN, according to a recent report. This is about the aggrandizement of a single attorney and his client that, while they may have a motion in this case that should be heard with respect and that we didn't rise to oppose when it first came here, but I'm rising now because I can't believe that we are going to allow this court in the Southern District of New York

to be treated this way. It is not appropriate, your Honor.

It shakes me to my boots that, at this point in my career, I have to rise to oppose this sort of conduct, which is laid out. We have not come in here and provided hearsay about a reporter who called him. If we had released those audiotapes to a reporter, it would have been the biggest story in America. It has not occurred. The audiotapes that we have, if any, that pertain to him, under lock and key, they are controlled by my law firm, TO, and POTUS, to the extent that there may be a claim of privilege related to them. I am unaware of any release of an audio file of this kind.

Now, let me address this further. I think what he has done today is rise to try and equate our behavior, but we are not squabbling children. And I know sometimes when lawyers get up and they fight like this in front of a court, we look that way, but it's not true. Because this goes to the very heart of what his intention is in this representation. His release of the bank secrecy issues, candidly, he shouldn't be asking us to answer questions, he should be asked to answer those questions himself.

I apologize for the vehemence that I have approached this this morning, your Honor. I think this is wrong, and I had to rise. I really didn't want to do this. But it is an issue now put before the court, and I think the appropriate way — there is a very strange thing going on in terms of any

discussions between the government and him, strange bedfellows, perhaps, but we haven't intervened in that. They said the motion is not here. I would urge you to tell — hold his application in abeyance because who knows what's going to trick out next week. Who knows what we are going to read, given the role of the inspector general, given the issues in the bankruptcy case. There is really no reason to rule today on this. I would respectfully request the court take the matter under advisement. If we are going to go forward with the motion, then the court will have heard us and you could rule at that time.

I thank you for hearing me.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Avenatti, do you wish to respond?

MR. AVENATTI: Yes, your Honor.

That was quite the tale --

THE COURT: Let's not comment on it.

MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, what Mr. Ryan just stated to the court, 95 percent of it is without any evidentiary basis whatsoever. There is no evidence that we engaged in any improper conduct relating to the release of any documents relating to Mr. Cohen. There is no evidence of that. And the reason why that is true, your Honor, is because we did not. We did not do anything improper relating to the release of information concerning Mr. Cohen; and, in any event, that has

nothing to do with this proceeding or with the standards under which we can be admitted —— I can be admitted pro hac vice.

There is no evidence that we did anything improper, your Honor.

There is no evidence that the inspector general is investigating me or our release of the information. There is no evidence of that whatsoever. We haven't been contacted by the inspector general. We haven't been contacted by anyone associated with the government. We haven't been contacted by the F.B.I. We haven't been contacted by the Treasury

Department. We have been contacted by no one —— no one, your Honor —— relating to anything that we have released.

THE COURT: I've a different view from you, from the one you have expressed earlier as to what it is that would subject you to the standards for professional responsibility in this court.

In my view, this matter, which is a potential precursor to a criminal trial if charges are filed against Mr. Cohen, I believe that once you are participating in this proceeding, you are subject to New York Code of Responsibility 3.6 and the local rule for the Southern District of New York 23.1. That means that you would have to stop doing some things you have been doing. If you participate here, you would not be able to declare your opinion as to Mr. Cohen's guilt, which you did; you would not be able to give publicity to documents that are not public. It would change your conduct. That is my only

possible role in doing what Mr. Cohen's lawyers want, which is, to essentially stop in its tracks your publicity tour on TV and elsewhere. And I say "publicity tour" not in a derogatory sense. You are entitled to publicity so long as — that is, I can't stop you, unless you are participating in this matter before me.

So I either want you to participate or not be in the matter at all. I don't want you to have some existence in a limbo, where you are free to denigrate Mr. Cohen and I believe potentially deprive him of a fair trial by tainting a jury pool. I know a jury, if there is one, is way down the road, and memories certainly may fade, but this conduct is inimicable to giving Mr. Cohen eventually a fair trial.

So unless you want to move to intervene, in which case you will be subject to all of these rules as well as this court's grievance committee, then I will hold in abeyance your motion pro hac vice, and you will not be permitted to use this court as a platform for anything because you won't be a participant in it.

MR. AVENATTI: And, your Honor, I don't believe that I have done that, quite honestly, your Honor. And we are the ones that -- I am the one that asked that the agenda item be placed on the agenda for consideration by your Honor, because we don't want to be in limbo per se, your Honor.

Now, Mr. Cohen's counsel, they are the ones that

oppose the court taking up my pro hac vice application today as set forth on the agenda, to be clear. So I ask that the court pass judgment on the pro hac vice application today.

THE COURT: I don't think that makes you a participant. You would have to --

MR. AVENATTI: I agree.

THE COURT: You would have to move to intervene, and you have no particular portfolio to intervene here unless it is Ms. Clifford's rights that you are protecting.

MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, I understand that. If the court -- if it is the court's inclination to hold the *pro hac* pending the motion to intervene decision or hearing, so be it. That is more than acceptable to us. We are continuing to work with the government.

Your Honor, I will note that now my concerns have been confirmed. Mr. Ryan states there are recordings relating to my client. They are under lock and key. He stated that on the record. So that's now been confirmed. So that raises considerable concerns. I will digest those concerns. We will move appropriately. But if there are recordings of my client's former counsel disclosing attorney-client privileged information, that is of significant concern to me and my client. And we will address that with the government, and we will attempt to arrive at a resolution, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.

Is there anything that we should take up in addition?

MS. MAIMIN: Your Honor, we would just respectfully
request that the court set a specific date in mid June for the
completion of Mr. Cohen's review.

MR. RYAN: Your Honor, could I be heard for one minute?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. RYAN: I want the court to understand something about the materials that we are dealing with. For example, if there is an hour-long conversation that's one of the 3.7 million files, one of our attorneys has to listen to that hour in order to do that or the TO or presidential lawyers have to. I don't think I can maintain quality control of a larger staff of attorneys working on this matter than we currently have. We are burning money at a rate, candidly, that I don't know that I can even increase.

THE COURT: I'm prepared to turn this over to a taint team which I view as fair.

MR. RYAN: But, your Honor, the 1.3 million records that we are through is a demonstration of how hard we have worked. We are working flat out. And, candidly, it was only on the 22nd that we obtained some of the latest devices that we have gotten and put them up. We are doing, candidly, a great job on this, and I don't think we could do more. I don't think it would be either fair or appropriate. The court faced this

decision of what would be fair and appropriate. The special master process is working perfectly. But an unrealistic deadline of mid June, I don't know that we can make that. And I just want the court to understand, I just don't know that we can do that.

I would ask the court's indulgence to not accept that date. Bring us back that date, and let us give you a report. Let the special master report to you on that date of where we are. I hear you that you want this done. And, you know, we have tried to get a process that worked for that, and I just ask the court to consider that in her ruling.

THE COURT: What I am considering in addition is the fact that the special master is able to keep up with the production with herself, I believe a partner, and perhaps a few others. They don't have an army. They don't have people sleeping on couches. They are able to speed up in a way that you are apparently not able to do.

MR. RYAN: I think I need to address that. The special master can correct this or my colleagues can correct it in the government or the intervening parties.

The special master initially was reviewing documents the same way we were, reviewing all of them. At this point I think the special master, while spot-checking things, is actually reviewing the privilege claims that we are making and then some extra things. Her staff is not doing what we are

doing and going through every document that we need to. And we are not going through every document. We are only going through the documents that actually the logic of the search terms tells us to look at. We are actually not looking at the ones that don't trigger that actually may contain privileged information, too.

We have already made compromises to meet the court's deadline is I guess the point I am trying to make. We are only reviewing documents that get a hit on the search terms for privilege. And so I think the special master really understands what we are doing, and I would just say that the June 15 date, I just don't know what I'm going to do to get that done. I need more time than that and, I think, I just ask you to consider that in your ruling.

MR. FUTERFAS: Your Honor, may I be heard on that?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FUTERFAS: We are very appreciative -- and I think Ms. Hendon would concur with this. We are aware of the work they are doing, and we are appreciative of the care they are giving. They are doing the first run of all of this material, and we are relying on their firm, as is president's counsel relying on them to carefully go through it and cull out and do the search terms and cull it out. So what we get is a very, very small subset. But I am trusting, as I believe Ms. Hendon is, that lawyers are carefully going through that and are doing

the right job and getting it to us. So we very much value this process. And I would say this, that, you know, I think we can all try and their firm can try for a date in mid June. We could come back, and maybe their firm only needs another week or another ten days to get it done, or whatever it might be.

But I can assure your Honor that, based on the conversation we have had with the special master, everyone has been working very well together. They are working very diligently. The process is working. We are getting the documents that we should be getting. So is the president's counsel. And we are well on the way to getting this done. So whether it is done on June 15 or it is done on June 20 or whatever it might be, this is a process that's working, and people are working very hard and we are trusted and invested in that process.

MS. HENDON: Your Honor --

MR. HARRISON: Judge --

THE COURT: I understand.

MS. HENDON: I'm sorry, Mr. Harrison.

If I could just make two points.

The first is that, without discussing here what I understand the special master and her small team to be doing, I do believe it is the case that it is something quite different than the McDermott team, and that if you switched tasks between the Bracewell firm and the McDermott team, the McDermott team

would be able to get everything done by June 15 and the Bracewell team would be saying, We need more time. It might make sense — it's entirely up to your Honor, if your Honor is inclined — to discuss this point, if your Honor does believe that too much time is being taken — which is not our observation at all — with the special master, because I don't feel it is my place to put on the record exactly what I understand that team to be doing and why it is that that team can move at a certain speed. That said, I know your Honor is keen to keep us all on a fast track, and I don't mean to quarrel with that in any way.

The second point I wanted to make was simply, on behalf of the president, we endorse fully every argument that Mr. Ryan and his team have made in writing concerning the pro hac application of Mr. Avenatti. We are glad that your Honor will hold it in abeyance, because it sounds as if your Honor has already done so, but the materials attached to Mr. Ryan's letter of yesterday warrant very careful scrutiny, in my view.

And I will just say that when I came into the courthouse this morning, there was a podium in front of the courthouse with eight microphones set up on that podium, and I walked by and nobody looked at me. Nobody wanted to take my picture. And I don't know, but I don't think that podium is there for Michael Cohen or Steve Ryan or for me.

Thank you, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 MR. HARRISON: Judge, just to put the point on --3 THE COURT: You were next, Mr. Harrison. 4 MR. HARRISON: Just to put the point on one quick 5 thing Mr. Ryan said, just so it is clear, I'm picking random 6 numbers, if we get a batch of 10,000 documents and we review 7 the 10,000 documents, we may only designate -- I am just making up numbers here -- 500 of them privileged. So we send those 8 9 privilege designations to the special master is how it is 10 working, and I think the special master is only reviewing those documents we have designated as privileged. So I think our 11 12 subset of review is much larger than the special master. 13 THE COURT: I understand. Thank you. Mr. Avenatti. 14 15 MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, briefly, I want to just 16 respond. 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 MR. AVENATTI: Thank you. Your Honor, Mr. Trump had adequate notice of my pro 19 20 hac vice application. They could have filed whatever they 21 wanted to file, his counsel could have, in opposition to that. 22 So let me address what was just stated to your Honor. 23 Counsel referenced the court to the attachments that 24 were filed yesterday. Those generally relate to a bankruptcy

proceeding concerning a firm that is not at issue in this case,

25

that has never represented Ms. Daniels, never will represent Ms. Daniels, and is not a firm that I presently work on behalf of in connection with this matter, to be clear.

THE COURT: How much of this is a distinction without a difference? You are the named partner in each firm. You operate out of the same office. What's the distinction?

MR. AVENATTI: Well, your Honor, I think it's a critical distinction, because that firm has never represented my client.

But I would like to address what counsel stated.

Counsel is directing the court to a bankruptcy judgment as reason why my pro hac vice should not be permitted, counsel who represents Mr. Trump, who has had his own fair share of bankruptcies over the years, and those haven't disqualified him in various contexts, so the irony of that, your Honor, is rather palpable. Furthermore, counsel is referring to tweet messages, I guess, that I sent. Well, we know that her client, her very own client, Mr. Trump, has tweeted about this matter in great detail and has tweeted about Mr. Cohen in great detail during these proceedings, so the irony, your Honor, of that is palpable.

Now, let me also address the microphones that are set up in front of the courthouse. If anyone in this courtroom believes that if my *pro hac* is denied those microphones are going to go away or the press that is seated here is no longer

going to attend, they are fooling themselves. Whether I'm in this case or not, this case is going to have a considerable amount of press attention, a considerable amount of public interest, and for good reason, because of the issues in the case and their seriousness as it relates to the President of the United States, your Honor.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

Ms. Hendon.

MS. HENDON: Thank you, your Honor.

I just would like to respond to the statement that I believe Mr. Avenatti said "that firm" -- referring to Eagan Avenatti or Avenatti Eagan -- "has never represented my client." I don't know how many times he said that. I notice that he put that in an affidavit that he filed with the court last night. That affidavit only has three paragraphs, and it was information in that affidavit that Mr. Avenatti chose to volunteer. No one asked him to put that affidavit in. And paragraph 3(a) states that "The firm of Eagan Avenatti LLP is not the law firm of Ms. Daniels."

With the court's permission, I would like to hand up what I have marked as Exhibit 1. We will give copies to Mr. Avenatti and Mr. Futerfas, plaintiff, and the government.

MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, I have no idea what this is.

THE COURT: You don't need to speak yet. I don't either.

MS. HENDON: As your Honor may be aware, Mr. Avenatti, on behalf of Ms. Daniels, has two actions pending in federal court — one in California, which is stayed, and one in this district before Judge Furman. As recently as last week, lawyers from the Avenatti Eagan firm were in communication with the president's counsel concerning the matter pending in this district. You will see that on I think the first e-mail.

The second e-mail likewise shows Avenatti Eagan -pardon me, Eagan Avenatti, attorneys or an attorney acting for
Ms. Clifford in an action against the president.

And the third e-mail from March 2018, just two months ago, is another Eagan Avenatti e-mail sent to counsel for the president -- this one in the California action -- on behalf of Ms. Clifford, and on that e-mail you see that Mr. Avenatti himself bears an Eagan Avenatti e-mail address.

Now, I had these materials when I first took the podium this morning to say I had two comments — one, I endorse Mr. Ryan and, two, you know, I think the McDermott firm has been working as hard as anyone can to get us the document — but I chose not to bring this up. But I think the court should note that Mr. Avenatti did not need to respond to that point. He did not need to put in this affidavit last night. He chose voluntarily to do it, and he was not straightforward with the

court. He was not open with the court.

If you read paragraph 3(a) carefully, "The firm of Eagan Avenatti LLP is not the law firm for Ms. Daniels." I don't know what that means, but it appears carefully constructed to create an impression with the court in a matter, frankly, of zero moment in these proceedings.

When I was a prosecutor and we would sum up in front of the jury, we would say to the jury: You know, when I elicited that untruthful or misleading statement about that little, tiny point from the defendant on cross, you were probably bored and you were probably wondering, ladies and gentlemen, why did I spend all that time on that little, tiny thing about which the defendant was not candid with you? And the reason I spent time on that -- and, your Honor, the reason I stood up again today -- is because when someone, especially a lawyer, is prepared to be not straight forward and cute and, I would say, misleading with the court on the tiniest of matters, it raises a serious question about how that person, how that lawyer will conduct himself on the more serious matters.

That's all, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. HENDON: I would ask that the court receive what I have marked as Exhibit 1, those three e-mails, as part of today's record.

THE COURT: All right. It is currently marked

1 Intervenor Exhibit 3. We will give it that designation. 2 MS. HENDON: That's fine, your Honor. THE COURT: It is received. 3 4 Is there anything further? 5 MS. MAIMIN: Yes, your Honor. We would just hope the 6 court could set a date in mid June for the production of 7 documents. 8 THE COURT: Good point. 9 Mr. Cohen's review of the materials currently in their 10 possession, in the possession of counsel for Mr. Cohen, must be 11 completed by June 15, 2018. If it is not, the balance of the 12 materials will go to the taint team which will review them. Ιt 13 is important for the court to balance the slow, deliberate 14 needs of those who are asserting attorney-client privilege with 15 the need for an investigation to go forward. 16 I would like to note to Mr. Avenatti that, until you 17 are admitted here, I don't expect you to stand and be heard 18 I have no control over what you do outside. I just here. wanted to be sure that was understood. 19 20 MR. AVENATTI: Understood, your Honor. Thank you. 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

000

special master decides it is a good time.

We will have the next conference as soon as the

25

22

23

24